

REMARKS

The amendment accompanying the present RCE embodies the amendment denied entry in the Advisory Action of May 26, 2010. The issues outstanding in the prior office action of February 4, 2010, are the requirement for restriction, the objection to the claims and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103. Reconsideration of these issues, in view of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Requirement for Restriction

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the allowability of the present claims as discussed below, claims 13-16 directed to methods of making the elected invention, and methods of using the elected invention, should now be rejoined for examination. The non-elected claims have been amended so that they depend from allowed claim 18, and as such are also clearly allowable.

Claim Objections

Claim 18 has been objected to as a result of the use of commas instead of decimal points. The claim has been amended, and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 4-8, 17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ross taken with Tecle. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested. Ross discloses an ink composition for deposition on the surface of a semiconductor device, in order to provide a contact area for connection to external circuitry. The composition comprises an ink system containing a metal powder, a binder, a vehicle, *a metal frit* and a fluxing agent. As noted in the office action, Ross does not disclose the use of an unsaturated fatty acid. It is moreover respectfully submitted that claim 1, as currently amended, excludes the metal frit of Ross. In Ross, the metal frit, having a melting point of 200 to 750°C, must become liquid in a heating step in order to establish a metallurgical bond between the surface and the metal powder. See column

3, lines 40-51. Since the metal frit is essential in Ross, even in combination with Tecle, one of ordinary skill in the art would not delete this material from the Ross composition and, accordingly, Ross even in combination with Tecle does not suggest the present claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 and 9-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ross and Tecle taken with Martin and Tsunaga. Reconsideration of this rejection is also respectfully requested.

The deficiencies of Ross and Tecle are discussed above. Martin and Tsunaga are cited to reach various features of the dependent claims, i.e., the use of a thermosetting resin as a binder or particular diluents. Inasmuch as these references do not remedy the deficiencies of Ross as discussed above, it is submitted that they also do not suggest these claims. Moreover, various of the present claims included in this rejection have been made dependent on allowable claim 18. It is thus submitted that these claims are also allowable. New claim 20 is directed to the paste as described in claim 1, but also includes a diluent.

It is submitted that all claims of the application are in condition for allowance, and passage to issue is respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he or she is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Harry B. Shubin/

Harry B. Shubin, Reg. No. 32,004
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410
Attorney Docket No.: MERCK-3161

Date: September 7, 2010

HBS/tls